



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Memorandum

Subject: **ACTION**: Program Guidance Letter 00-04

Date: Aug 17, 2000

From: Manager, Airports Financial Assistance
Division, APP-500

Reply to
Attn. of:

To: PGL Distribution List

00-4.1 List of Airports Required to Submit a Competition Plan – Jim Borsari
(202)267-8822.

Program Guidance Letter (PGL) 00-3 provided a list of possible airports that would be required to submit a competition plan if the criteria were based upon CY 1998 data for enplanements and market share. Recipients of that PGL were advised that the list would be updated based upon information available in July.

In Attachment A, we are providing a list based upon the CY 1999 preliminary enplanement and market share data. Three airports (Jacksonville, FL, Louisville, KY and El Paso, TX) that in the previous list would have had to submit a plan no longer meet the criteria for the requirement. One airport (Milwaukee) that previously was not on the list is included in the attached list.

Normally, for the purpose of validating enplanement information for AIP entitlement calculations, we send the preliminary information to airports for review. Generally, all changes requested by airports are reviewed as they are reported to FAA and all enplanement data is reconciled during September so that entitlements can be apportioned at the start of the fiscal year. If we were to wait until October to notify airports of the requirement for a competition plan for either AIP or PFC, the process could delay processing of necessary AIP or PFC actions. In advising airports now of the likely requirement using the preliminary information, we are confident that the data is sufficient to provide timely notice.

It is possible that the normal validation process could change either an airport's status as a large or medium hub (or elevation from small hub) or the relative market share of the top two carriers at an airport may affect the need to submit a

competition plan between the attached list and the final data in October. If an airport requests changes as a result of this review that will change its status or market share, that airport could be added or taken from the attached list when the official data is finalized for FY 2001. Our analysis of the preliminary data has identified only a few airports that could see the possibility of either a market share shift or an airport status change. It is therefore important that all airports review their enplanement numbers expeditiously.

Original Signed by

Barry L. Molar

FY 2001 Competition Plans Required Based upon Preliminary Data	
Phoenix, AZ	
Burbank, CA	
Oakland, CA	
Ontario, CA	
Sacramento, CA	
San Francisco, CA	
San Jose, CA	
Denver, CO	
Miami, FL	
West Palm Beach, FL	
Atlanta, GA	
Kahului, HI	
Chicago (Midway), IL	
Chicago (O'Hare), IL	
Covington, KY	
Baltimore, MD	
Detroit, MI	
Minneapolis, MN	
St. Louis, MO	
Reno, NV	
Newark, NJ	
Albuquerque, NM	
Charlotte, NC	
Cleveland, OH	
Philadelphia, PA	
Pittsburgh, PA	
San Juan, PR	
Providence, RI	
Austin, TX	
Dallas (Love Field), TX	
Dallas/Forth Worth, TX	
Houston (Bush Intercontinental), TX	
Houston (Hobby), TX	
San Antonio, TX	
Memphis, TN	
Nashville, TN	
Salt Lake City, UT	
Loudon (Washington Dulles), VA	
Milwaukee, WI	